

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 127

April 6, 1995, 2:02 p.m.
Page S-5303 Temp. Record

DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS/Cloture

SUBJECT: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Dole motion to close debate on the Hatfield substitute amendment No. 420.

ACTION: CLOTURE MOTION REJECTED, 56-44

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$5.360 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, and will rescind \$17.188 billion for various Departments and agencies.

The Hatfield substitute amendment would strike the provisions of H.R. 1158 and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 617, as reported, which would provide \$6.700 billion in disaster assistance (the amount requested by the President), would rescind \$13.286 billion for various Departments and agencies, and would provide for expedited salvage timber sales on Federal lands for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

On April 4, 1995, Senator Dole sent to the desk, for himself and others, a motion to close debate on the Hatfield substitute amendment.

NOTE: The motion to invoke cloture requires a three-fifths majority (60) vote of the Senate to succeed.

Those favoring the motion to invoke cloture contended:

We are greatly disappointed with Democratic efforts to filibuster this bill. Many of them spent most of the month of February insisting that Members only needed the backbone, not a balanced budget amendment, to reduce the deficit. Now that a rescission bill that will cut a tiny 1 percent of the budget is before us, our colleagues on the left side of the aisle have lost their spine. For one week behind-the-scene negotiations have been conducted between Democrats and Republicans. Those negotiations have largely consisted of Democratic demands for increased spending on various pet social programs of theirs that would suffer rescissions in the Hatfield substitute amendment, and Republican demands that any such increases be offset by even greater rescissions in other

(See other side)

YEAS (56)			NAYS (44)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (44 or 96%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Moynihan		Akaka		
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Pell		Baucus		
Bennett	Jeffords			Biden		
Bond	Kassebaum			Bingaman		
Brown	Kempthorne			Boxer		
Burns	Kyl			Bradley		
Campbell	Lott			Breaux		
Chafee	Lugar			Bryan		
Coats	Mack			Bumpers		
Cochran	McCain			Byrd		
Cohen	McConnell			Conrad		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Daschle		
Craig	Nickles			Dodd		
D'Amato	Packwood			Dorgan		
DeWine	Pressler			Exon		
Dole	Roth			Feingold		
Domenici	Santorum			Feinstein		
Faircloth	Shelby			Ford		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn		
Gorton	Smith			Graham		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin		
Grams	Specter			Hefflin		
Grassley	Stevens					
Gregg	Thomas					
Hatch	Thompson					
Hatfield	Thurmond					
Helms	Warner					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

areas. While the negotiations have continued, 72 Democratic amendments have been proposed. Of these amendments, 41 would still be germane under post-cloture rules. Perhaps we Republicans should have insisted that Democrats offer their amendments over the course of the past week so that they could be promptly disposed of, but instead of rejecting their amendments we waited and tried to reach a compromise in good faith.

Perhaps we were too trusting. Several times we thought we had reached a compromise agreement, but new demands were always made. The appearance is that some Democrats are filibustering this bill, hoping to push its consideration up against the Easter/Passover recess. A vote against cloture will strongly reinforce this impression. Surely the right to offer 41 amendments in post-cloture debate should be enough to cover the gamut of our Democratic colleagues' reallocation and spending increase suggestions. Nevertheless, our colleagues tell us that they intend to vote against cloture. We are astounded that they are willing to jeopardize the passage of this bill. The lapdog liberal press, of course, will not tell on them for filibustering this deficit reduction bill, but that failure will hardly matter. The overwhelming rejection of Democrats in the last election shows that the American people do not believe the propaganda from the liberal elite of the networks and the daily papers. Our colleagues are astute politicians; they know that filibustering this bill to death may well catch up with them at the polls.

To increase pressure on our recalcitrant colleagues, we have informed the President that the Senate will not pass the conference report on the DoD supplemental until this bill passes. The President greatly desires passage of that supplemental, so we are hopeful he will bring some pressure to bear on his party members. Additionally, if cloture is not invoked, the Easter recess may have to be delayed to make it possible to have another cloture vote on Saturday. Our colleagues have stretched out this debate, so we are now forced to up the ante. We commend those Democrats who have worked with us in good faith to reach a compromise solution, and we are hopeful that a solution will yet be reached. In our minds, we have already made substantial concessions. If those Senators with whom we are negotiating can hold their Members in line behind an agreement, we still think we can finish this bill tonight, even though we suspect we will not prevail on this cloture vote.

Those opposing the motion to invoke cloture contended:

Negotiations have been conducted in good faith to resolve differences on the Hatfield substitute amendment. Unfortunately, no agreement has been reached. Further, no real progress has been made on amendments during these negotiations. We objected to elements of the Hatfield amendment when it was offered, and, as it is largely unchanged, we still find the amendment to be unacceptable. H.R. 1158 has three purposes: to provide disaster aid; to reduce the deficit; and to make those reductions by cutting low priority accounts. The Hatfield amendment would fall short on the third purpose. It would make deep cuts in social programs, including welfare and education programs. We strongly oppose these proposed cuts. Until we can reach some type of agreement to add back funding for these social programs and instead cut less important programs we will be forced to oppose any effort to close debate.